DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 108 353 EA 007 270

AUTHOR Garberina, William L., Sr.
TITLE The Principal as Powerbroker.
PUB DATE 2 Apr 75
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (60th, Washington, D.C., March 31-April 4, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Education; Educational Policy; Elementary Education; *Organization; *Political Influences; Politics; *Power Structure; *Principals

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to examine the variables affecting the power relationships between an elementary principal, his superordinates, and his subordinates as they relate to the conversion of policy decisions into organizational practices. With the centralization of school districts, the increased pressure for community participation in school decisions, the rise of teacher militancy, and the push for a code of students' rights, power relationships in school systems have been in a state of flux. The model presented is based on data collected when the author was participant-observer in a school district. (Author/IRT)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED108353

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Principal As Powerbroker

by

William L. Garberina, Sr.

A.E.R.A.
Washington, D.C.
April 2, 1975

EA 007 270

The Principal As Powerbroker

by

William L. Garberina, Sr.

Introduction

The apolitical myth that "politics and education do not mix" has assisted in developing the norms by which the politics of education are carried out at the federal, state, and local levels. Nicholas A. Masters and his team found politicans, at least at the state level, had concluded that there is no political coinage in education.[1] This attitude not only precludes open debate on educational issues, but allows the statewide associations of professional educators to control the format of educational bills.

This tendency toward a closed system of political debate regarding education can be viewed at the school district level. In the process of operationalizing school district policy, its implementation deviates, to a greater or lesser degree, from the original intent of the stated policy. The community which the school district serves has limited access to the area of policy implementation. This tendency toward a closed system

---

[1] Nicholas A. Masters, Robert H. Salisbury, and Thomas H. Eliot, State Politics and Public Schools, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1964), pp. 275-276.

at the local level of education is not only a result of the apolitical myth and its resultant norms, but from the nature of schools as an organization.

Carlson has suggested that public schools are domesticated organizations and are not compelled to attend to all of their needs. As with domesticated animals, adaptation to the environment is not as problematic. These organizations are slow to respond to the needs of their environment. A continual flow of clients is assured, and support is not closely tied to performance.[2]

School organizations, therefore, present a unique vehicle for the study of policy implementation. Bidwell has suggested that "the looseness of system structure and the notion of the teaching task seem to press for a professional mode of school system organization, while demands for uniformity of product and the long time span over which cohorts of students are trained press for rationalization of activities and thus for a bureaucratic base of organization."[3] This conflict places the principal, as a member of middle management in the authority structure, in a unique situation. The school is an organization

---

[2]Richard O. Carlson, "Environmental Constraints and Organizational Consequences: The Public School and Its Clients" In Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, ed. by Daniel C. Griffiths, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), pp. 262-276.

[3]Charles E. Bidwell, "The School as a Formal Organization," in Handbook of Organizations, ed. by James G. March, (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1965), pp.976-977.

which rests ultimate authority in the chief school officer, the principal. On the other hand the school is an organization which lodges informal control over some activities with the subordinates, the teachers. Moreover the trend toward collective negotiations has created a structure for the teachers which enables them to deal directly with the top levels of administration.

Becker's study of Chicago school teachers provides an insight into the situation.[4] Although the principal is accepted as the supreme authority in the school, conflict and tension could result when the principal ignores the teachers' needs for professional independence and defense against attacks on their informal authority. Hanson has noted that only under unusual circumstances will teachers or principals take their problems to third parties. He states "the limits in both cases seem to be associated with the point at which important third parties, such as parents, the board, the superintendent, or prestigious members of the community become aware that something out of the ordinary is in the wind."[5]

---

[4]Howard S. Becker, "The Teacher in the Authority System of the Public School," in Complex Organizations, ed. by Amitai Etzoni (Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961), p.248.

[5]Mark Hanson, "The Emerging Control Structure of Schools," Administrator's Notebook, Vol. XXI, No. 2, May, 1973.

The Problem

The purpose of this paper was to examine the variables effecting the power relationships between an elementary principal, his superordinates and subordinates, as they relate to the conversion of policy decisions into organizational practices. With the centralization of school districts, the increased pressure for community participation in school decisions, the rise of teacher militancy, and the push for a code of students' rights, power relationships in school systems have been in a state of flux. Although these changes have brought about shifts in power relationships among school boards, superintendents, and teachers, a review of recent literature indicates that the role of principal, and the effects these changes have on this role, has received cursory examination. Lutz and Azzarelli, for example, in describing the struggle for control in educational organizations, examine the conflict between teacher organizations, the superintendent, and school boards.[6] Although providing valuable insights into this conflict, the role of the principal is completely ignored.

The study of the Jefferson School District documents the principal's relationship to the informal structure in one of the elementary schools in the district.

---

[6]Frank W. Lutz and Joseph J. Azzarelli, Struggle for Power in Education, (New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966).

> Jarret's position as principal of Whitman made it virtually impossible for him to be also a leader of the informal organization. . . . To achieve support that would make him what Mr. Black, in fact, came nearest to being-informal leader of the staff-Jarret would have to have had to lead them in their effort to reverse the power pattern of the district. . . A principal's possibility for becoming the informal leader of his staff are nonexistent.[7]

Given his role the principal was powerless in the informal organization, and often powerless in blocking the informal structure.

In a study of the New York School System, Rogers describes the various factors relating to the problems effecting principals in a changing social system. He notes that relationships between teachers and principals, when authoritarian and paternalistic, produce high degrees of conflict. Teachers want a more egalitarian and professional relationship, suggesting that decisions about school policy and procedures should be made jointly with teacher representatives, rather than unilaterally by the principal.[8] Although this study examines the various policy decisions modified at the building level, it does not describe the manner in which these decisions were modified. Moreover, reasons and descriptions of policy

---

[7]Daniel E. Griffiths, David L. Wynn, D. Richard, and Laurence Iannacone, Organizing Schools for Effective Education, (Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1962), p. 269.

[8]David Rogers, 110 Livingston Street, (New York: Vintage Books, 1968), p. 282.

implementation at the building level of those decisions that were not modified, as opposed to others, were not detailed.

Evidence gathered in other bureaucracies suggests that individuals concerned with the implementation of policy modify the outcomes of the system by emphasizing some aspects of their jobs while ignoring others. Blau's study of a state employment agency indicates the manner in which personnel modified and resisted new policy changes to ensure efficiency.[9] Studies of mental hospitals, prisons, and industry reveal the organizational strain of policy procedures on the various role incumbents of the organization.[10] Etizoni depicts the inevitable strain placed on organizations by the use of knowledge. When professionals, such as doctors, or semiprofessionals, such as nurses and teachers, are employed in an organization, their professional attitudes may clash with the rules and constraints of the bureaucracy.[11] Hence, policy statements may be modified or altered in their implementation to coincide with the professional's view of his role. These studies point out the difference between policy statements and their implementation. Katz and Kahn define organizational

---

[9]Peter M. Blau, The Dynamics of Bureaucracy, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), pp. 183-200.

[10]For an overview of these studies, see Oscar Grusky and George A. Miller, The Sociology of Organizations, (Toronto: The Free Press, 1970), pp. 261-424.

[11]Amitai Etizoni, Modern Organizations, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964), pp. 75-89.

policies as "abstractions or generalizations about organizational behavior, at a level which involves the structure of the organization."[12] This definition does not imply that policies are behaviors. Although policy statements are a starting point to determine if changes in the system ave taken place, the authors state:

> The organization is a social system and the conciously expressed intent of some of its members is not to be confused with the functioning of the system. Hence, when officials announce a change in policy ... we should look at the actual systemic changes taking place rather than accepting the statement at face value.[13]

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework that will be used to collect and analyze the data for this study will be drawn from four sources. Its focus will be a general systems model. Hall and Fagen define a system as a set of objects together, with relationships between the objects and between their attributes.[14]

---

[12] Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966) p. 259.

[13] Ibid., p. 261.

[14] A.D. Hall and R.E. Fagen, "Definition of a System," in Modern Systems Research for the Behavioral Scientist, ed. by Walter Buckley, (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1968), pp. 428-436.

The specific general systems theory to be used in this report will be David Easton's model for studying dynamics of a political system.[15] This model consists of three main categories. The environment exchanges inputs and outputs with the political subsystem in the forms of demands and supports. The inputs from the environment enter the system and are converted or modified by the components of the system. This is referred to as the conversion process. The demands or supports, now modified by the system, emerge as outputs to the environment. School systems, since they do allocate values and resources to the environment that they serve, can fit Easton's model.

Since this study is concerned with the power relationships of a role incumbent and its effect on policy execuetion, the theoretical framework will be concerned with the conversion process that occurs within the political system. Wirt and Kirst state that not all demands are converted into policy. The political system evidences sensitivity to certain values, those dominant in the conversion machinery and its personnel. In short, what gets through depends on which values the conversion machinery reinforces and which it frustrates.[16]

---

[15]David Easton, "A Systems Analysis of Political Life," in Hall and Fagen, op. cit.

[16]Frederick M. Wirt and Micheal W. Kirst, The Political Web of American Schools, (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1972), pp. 15-16.

In an attempt to clarify this process, portions of the Tri-Systems Model developed by Lutz and Iannacone will be used.[17] Those authors state that a power analyst must focus his observations on some specific place or be overwhelmed by the data.[18] The specific place in this study will be the role of principal in an educational organization. The concepts of points of tangency, systemic linkage, territoriality and boundary maintenance appear useful in explaining a theory to describe the power relationships of role incumbents with their superiors, subordinates, and environment. For purposes of this paper,

> A point of tangency is the occurrence of a formal or informal group (subsystem) within the social structure of the school district which provides a vehicle for communicating between the formal structure and the community it serves.[19]

point of tangency shall refer to all groups interacting with the role incumbent, principal. Systemic linkage is the occurrence of interaction and sentiment between groups.[20]

Groups within an organizational system, or the subsystems of the organization, occupy territory. Terrioriality is a concept meaning the space that is occupied by the subsystem.[21]

---

[17] See Frank W. Lutz and Laurence Iannacone, Understan ing Educational Organizations, (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1969), chpt. 4, pp. 61-95, for a complete description of the model.

[18] Ibid., p. 77.

[19] Ibid., p. 77

[20] Ibid., p. 78.

[21] Ibid., p. 80.

This territory can be physical, a teacher's lounge, or cognitive, the right of a teacher to determine when and in what manner lessons shall be taught. Territory can be acquired legitimately; a principal is hired to run a school, or it can be acquired informally; a teacher feels that the overhead projector is hers because it has been in her room for two years.

Territory is protected through boundary maintenance. Boundary maintenance is a condition of protecting boundary-owned territory.[22] It can only be observed when the territory is being invaded.

Since this paper is concerned with power relationships and their effect on policy implementation, a definition of power will be needed that can incorporate the various interactions across systemic linkages. Muth views power behavior on a continuum. He defines three ideal types of power as follows:

> Coercion - the capacity of an actor to compel another to do as the actor intends, regardless of the other's wishes.
> Authority - the legitimation of an actor's ability to affect another's behavior.
> Influence - the capacity of an actor, without recourse to force or direct authority, to persuade another to behave as the actor desires.[23]

The results of these power acts will lead to consensus or conflict. Conflict is inherent to those relationships in

---

[22] Ibid., p. 80.

[23] Rodney Muth, "Teacher Perceptions of Power, Conflict, and Consensus," Administrator's Notebook, Vol. XXI, No. 4, (April, 1973).

which disagreement exists as to the outcome of the behaviors involved. Conversely, consensus is inherent to those relationships in which disagreement does not exist as to the outcome of the behaviors involved.[24] Acts of influence generally lead to consensus, while acts of coercion generally lead to conflict.

Since the conversion process of a social system may modify some organizational policies and not others, it is important to distinguish between types of organizational policy and the accompanying decision-making aspects of the policies. Katz and Kahn state that as abstractions of organizational behavior, policy statements may be either prospective or retrospective. Retrospective policy is merely a process of recognition; the pattern was there but was not previously stated or formally acknowledged. Prospective policy statements are generalizations about what organizational behavior shall be, at a level implying changes in organizational structures.[25] Prospective policy statements are, therefore, an aspect of organizational change, the decision-making aspect. The two generalized types of categories of policy statements can then be distinguished as four subtypes effecting decision-making. They are as follows:

---

[24] Ibid., Vol. XXI, No. 4, (April, 1973).

[25] Katz and Kahn, op. cit., p. 259.

(1) policy-making as the formulation of substantive goals and objectives;
(2) policy-making as the formulation of procedures and devices for achieving goals and evaluating performance;
(3) routine administration, or the application of existing policies to ongoing operations;
(4) residual, ad hoc decisions affecting organizational space with no temporal implications beyond the immediate event.[26]

Although the source of power comes from a collective group, the power, either formally or informally, must be manifested through an individual. Hence the interaction taking place in a systemic linkage will be confined to individuals proporting to represent groups' territorial boundaries.

The following predictive statements will guide the data collection and analysis for this report.

I. Policy decisions and their operationalization will be congruent if the policy can be implemented without a disturbance of physical and cognitive territories of the subsystems.

II. The extent to which policy decisions redefine established territories of subsystems will be the extent to which such policies are misinterpreted, reinterpreted, or frustrated in their implementation.

III. In the implementation of policy decisions, subsystems will first attempt to operationalize the policy without disturbing existing boundaries.

IV. When cognitive or physical space exists that is not legitimately or informally claimed by a subsystem, policy decisions will be interpreted to claim such physical or cognitive space.

---

[26] Ibid., p. 260.

V. A school principal is the point of tangency and systemic linkage between the central administration and school staff regarding the implementation of building policy in the school.

VI. A school principal is the point of tangency and systemic linkage between the central administration and school staff regarding the implementation of school district policy in the school building.

The Method

The researcher used fieldwork methods to collect the data necessary for this study. Fieldwork has been belittled as unscientific because it is not as rigorous as structured, traditional, statistical inquiries. Sometimes quantitative data is difficult to obtain or will not adequately describe a problem worthy of investigation by social scientists. Dean, Eichhorn, and Dean depict several examples; such as case histories of an individual, organization or a community, testing of hypotheses when structured methods cannot be employed, and pilot inquiries into new problem areas when the purpose is the production of hypotheses rather than their verification.[27] Lutz and Iannacone describe various studies using the fieldwork approach in the examination of power in education, ranging from a single school to state legislature.[28]

---

[27]John P. Dean, Robert L. Eichhorn, and Lois R. Dean, "Establishing Field Relations," in George J. McCall and J.L. Simmons, Issues in Participant Observation, (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969), p. 20.

[28]Frank W. Lutz and Laurence Iannacone, Understanding Educational Organizations: A Field Study Approach, (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1969), pp. 102-106.

The fieldworker constantly moves from his data to the recording and analysis of it, and back again to the data. This allows the researcher to investigate new areas as the data warrants, providing more fruitful information for the emerging hypotheses. Since the original statements are not hypotheses, they are subject to modification in terms of the data. An important aspect of data collection and analysis is the deviant case. These are the incidents which are not confirmed by the original statements, and, hence, cause the modification of them. Verification of data is essential in fieldwork. One method of verification is the observance of repeated behavior. The use of informants can help the fieldworker to gain access to meetings or ceremonies to which he is not entitled, or to shed additional light on data for reliability and validity. Written documents, by-laws, and minutes of meetings also assist in these functions.

Gold has suggested four possible roles for re earchers doing field work. They are complete participant, participant-as-observer, observer-as-participant, and complete observer.[29] The researcher took the role of complete participant for collecting data for this paper. Basically the complete participant

---

[29]Raymond L. Gold, "Roles in Sociological Field Observations," in McCall and Simmons, op. cit., p. 30.

does not divulge his scientific role to the social system being studied. He is in a role in the system which would exist whether or not he is there. This allows him to be privy to certain secret meetings. Also he can substantiate data by the use of informants in the natural setting. Questionnaires and surveys may also be used by the complete participant as long as they are natural extensions of the role.

The complete participant must be careful not to become subject to the emotional biases of the role. Gold summarizes the problems of the complete participant by stating that he may become so self-concious about revealing his true self that he is handicapped when attempting to perform convincingly in the pretended role. He may 'go native' and incorporate into his self-conceptions and self-expression the biases of the role. When this occurs he finds that he has violated his observer role to such an extent that he is unable to report his findings objectively.[30] The field worker who takes on the role of the complete participant must be mindful of these pitfalls, and use the data, informants, documents and other devices to constantly corroborate his observed data.

---

[30]Gold, op. cit., p. 34.

Data Collection and Analysis

The research was conducted between July 1, 1973 and July 1, 1974 in the Union County School District. The Union County School District is located in the central portion of a large coastal state. Although the state is considered highly industrialized, Union County is in a rural area.

The researcher took the role of participant observer during this study. He occupied the role of elementary principal, supervising five buildings in the district. In addition to his own observations, data were collected from the following sources; newspapers, secondary observations, memorandums and various policy handbooks. Due to the large amount of data collected, and the constraints of this paper, one example will be given that, in the view of the author, exemplifies the main assumptions of this work.

Since any study of a power system only describes that system at a particular point in time, it tends to appear as a stagnant structure, not a dynamic one. To compensate for this, data are presented in chronological order, so the reader can have a feel for the dynamics of the power system. The analysis will also be presented in chronological order. The analysis, rather than being empirical and operational, will be conceptual and linked to the theory.

An Example

In November of 1973 Mr. Run, the superintendent of the Union County School District, called a meeting of all of the principals. This was unusual, as he generally had separate meetings for the four elementary and four secondary principals. The meeting was held in the Board room of the central administration building. After everyone had settled into their seats, Mr. Run began the meeting.

> Mr. Run: "I've asked you here this morning to discuss teacher ratings. Each of you have a copy of the PR-80 that's sent to the State Department. At the top is a rating scale each district can use to rate teachers. It's optional and we've not been using it. Next week I want you to rate teachers based on the form. . . ."

He described each item in the form and the numerical weight given to each item. The scale had four categories; personality, professional preparation, classroom performance, and student performance. Each category had a weight of 20 points. The final category, seniority, was based on the number of years that a teacher worked in the state. Anyone teaching over twenty years could only receive twenty points. As each item was described, the principals discussed various ways to assign point titles to them. When the discussion terminated Mr. Run addressed the group again.

Mr. Run: "Our enrollments are declining. This form will enable us to eliminate staff based on their evaluations. In order to do this we need at least four ratings. We'll have four by the end of next year."

Mr. King: "I think we're not doing this right. We should have a few meetings so we'll all be sure we're rating the same way. The union won't go for this."

Mr. Run: "We can work on that for next term. I want you to start rating the teachers now. You can tell them we want the ratings for this term, but next time the thing will be fairer because we all went through it once."

Mr. Stan: "I like Joe's idea. We could use the new classroom evaluation and apply it to the rating."

Mr. James: "I don't see where this one helps us. The old form was looser. This one doesn't fit all the categories."

Mr. Cramp: "That's right. I haven't been rating teachers according to this form. What do I do about a teacher I rated in September. How do I ...

Mr. Run: "I want this started next week. We'll iron out problems next term. This should have top priority because I want all of you in the classrooms, finding out what's going on. When I meet with each of you in January, I want your ratings to be based on the form."

With that the discussion ceased, and the meeting was adjourned shortly. On the way to their cars, Mr. Walker, the newest principal in the district, discussed the new events with Mr. James, principal of the schools in the county seat of Myersberg.

Mr. Walker: "How are you going to handle this?"

Mr. James: "I'll hold a faculty meeting at the end of the week and tell the teachers. Run's doing this because some of these guys, especially the secondary ones, aren't getting into the classrooms. Some of them haven't seen ten teachers so far."

Mr. Walker: "He's really big on evaluations, eh?"

Mr. James: "I'll bet your raise will depend alot on how well you do with this. Elmer didn't get a raise last year because he didn't get in to see the teachers, and Run knew it."

The two principals discussed the agenda for their faculty meetings, and the manner in which they would handle the situation. Mr. Walker returned to his office and pondered this new problem. He notified all five buildings that there would be a faculty meeting on Thursday at Steelton elementary. He then spent portions of Wednesday and Thursday morning working on his speech to the teachers.

At 3:15 on Thursday he met with the entire staff of 84 teachers. After apologizing for the suddenness of the meeting, he said:

Mr. Walker: "I've distributed the forms that go into the State department twice a year. As you know, they only say that you were rated satisfactory or unsatisfactory. Starting with this term, the final rating will be accompanied by an overall numerical rating...."

Mr. Walker proceeded to outline the four categories and the point system. He informed the teachers that this rating was to be used only in case of a drop in enrollment and a subsequent reduction in staff positions. This would give the district an objective criteria for releasing staff members.

Miss Lee: "This form is so old. Some of these things don't apply anymore. Look at the one about community work. Does that mean that if I don't attend any meetings, I'll get a zero. And how do you know if I do or not?"

Mr. Walker: "There are some that are like that. I'll just give everybody full credit for those kind."

Mr. Zenos: "Here's another one. Under professional preparation, the one about taking at least three credits during the last school term. What about older teachers who've got a Masters and don't want to take anymore credits, or can't afford it."

Mr. Walker: "That's right. That's another one."

Mrs. Canton: "My husband says that his principal said no one can get an eighty because no one is perfect. If this rating says there are eighty points, I think you can get an eighty."

Mr. Walker: "In this area you can get an eighty if you deserve it."

The principal then informed the teachers that the principals would be meeting and working on a standardization of the scale for all teachers in the district for the next term. He promised to continue having conferences after each observation, and would rate the teachers already evaluated in the classroom. If they wanted to challenge the rating, they could arrange a conference.

The first term in Union County School District ended on December twenty-two. Mr. Walker completed all observations and conferences, and sent the results to Mr. Lemon, the assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction. In late January Mr. Walker was called into Mr. Run's office to defend his evaluations.

Mr. Walker knew that he had rated the teachers too high to suit Mr. Run. His average for all 84 teachers was 75.0, which fell into the excellent category in the rating scale. As a new principal Mr. Walker had been reluctant to be too severe in his observations. Before the rating scale was put into effect, this would not have caused problems, because the previous form was subjective in nature with no numerical scale.

After going over each individual evaluation with Mr. Run, the superintendent said;

Mr. Run: "Joey, you seem to have gotten to know your teachers, and the evaluations are pretty thorough. You seem to have rated them pretty high. In fact your the highest of all the principals."

Mr. Walker: "Because I'm knew I felt that I couldn't be too critical the first time around. How can I justify giving a teacher a low rating when I've only seen her for 45 minutes. Anyway these teachers aren't used to critical observations. Mr. Predecessor always made excellent comments on his evaluations. I thought I'd give them the benefit of the doubt the first time, and be more critical after that. I'd have something to compare performances too."

Mr. Run: "I agree with you. In the last few years, those teachers in your area got away with a lot. They're not used to close supervision. But I hope your scores will come down next time."

Mr. Walker: "Don't worry. The teachers are expecting it. I'm having a faculty meeting about it this week."

Mr. Run: "Good. See you in June, and I hope those ratings are more spread out."

Mr. Walker had announced another full faculty meeting at Steelton elementary to discuss the new observation process. After the ratings had been delivered to the teachers by the principals prior to the Christmas break, the Union County Teachers Association asked the central administration to form a joint committee to produce an objective and standardized evaluation for the State Department form, PR-80. Many of the teachers were upset because some received ratings without being observed. Some principals, like Mr. Walker, had rated all teachers extremely high, while Mr. King's average was 66.0. All of these factors had led to a tense situation in the district.

Mr. Walker met with the faculty during the second week of January.

Mr. Walker: "This term each teacher will be observed at least once. New teachers will be seen at least twice. After each observation, we'll have a conference. At that time I will give you the numerical evaluation for all items pertaining to the observation. The rest will have to wait to the end of the term. If you wish to challenge any ratings, you can. I'll be glad to observe you again if you want. This time the ratings will be more severe. I mean that last time I gave everyone the benefit of the doubt, even if I saw a poor lesson because it was the first time I had seen you. This time I'll have a comparison, and will be more critical. This will necessarily lower the overall average for the schools. Of course those who deserve a high rating will get one."

Mr. Walker then reviewed the items and the point system with the teachers. He opened the meeting for discussion.

Mrs. Monson (building representative at Steelton): "Do you think it's fair to give a lower rating to a teacher who received an excellent rating during the first term?"

Mr. Walker: "I've explained that a closer observance will necessarily lower the ratings for some."

Mrs. Monson: "But that looks like the person has gotten worse."

Mr. Walker: "Each observation is independent of the other. I might see a teacher in their weakest area. Naturally, the rating won't be as good. A good teacher will get a good rating no matter what she's teaching."

Mrs. Monson: "Who rates you, Mr. Walker? How do you justify this rating form to somebody else? Why can't we rate you?

Mr. Walker: "I have to go over everybody's final rating with Mr. Run. If he doesn't think they are fair, I get told about it.

Mrs. Albert: "Do we?"

Mr. Walker: "That kind of thing will be worked out by the joint committee. Until then I can only say I'll be as fair as I can and each one of you will be given the opportunity to change any rating if you can justify it to me."

The meeting continued for a few minutes more, and teachers asked about conferences and the types of questions that they would be asked.

The following week Mr. Walker began his observations. His average for the second term dropped to 68.7. This time Mr. Run was pleased with the results.

The superintendent, Mr. Run, wished to implement a new policy regarding observation and evaluation. The meeting of all the principals recognized them as the point of tangency and systemic linkage between the central administration and the teachers. The superintendent had two problems; however, (1) to implement a new evaluation criteria late in the first term; and, create a mechanism whereby his office could control the rate of observation by principals.

His statement about the old forms to be used was an attempt to gain concensus for the policy through the mirage of routine administration of retrospective policy.

The principals immediately ascertained that this form would create disturbances in the existing territories of their buildings. The long debate over the various items in the rating form was an attempt bb the principals to maintain existing boundaries regarding supervision. When this ploy did not work, Mr. Run insisted that four ratings were needed in the next two years, the principals attempted to delay the beginning of the observations. Mr. King, Mr. Stan, and Mr. James all offered excuses for delay. At this point Mr. Run abandon the possibility of consensual agreement, and employed a coercive power act. The statement that " I want this started next week, We'll iron out problems next term" told the principals that this was to be the policy of the school district.

Also, the observation and evaluation were turned into prospective policy regarding change in the structure of the organization. "When I meet with you in January, I want your ratings to be based on the form" told the principals that PR-30 was not only a way to evaluate the teachers, but represented a means for the superintendent to measure the principal's performance.

Mr. Walker had not disturbed the territories established by the previous principal concerning observations. Although his observations were more rigorous, the evaluation of the observations were as highly complimentary as the former principal. The implementation of the new policy would disturb this delicate balance. Mr. Walker's first faculty meeting was an attempt to ensure the teachers that he would maintain these boundaries despite the thrust of the new policy. He accomplished this feat by admitting that some of the areas of the rating scale were outmoded and that "I'll just give everybody full credit for those kind." Mr. Walker received a consensus for the first term, and the boundaries in the schools concerning observation were maintained.

During Mr. Walker's meeting with Mr. Run the following January, it was clear to the superintendent that Mr. Walker had implemented the policy, but not with the desired impact that the superintendent had hoped to accomplish. "The

evaluations are pretty thorough. You seem to have rated them pretty high," indicates that Mr. Run was displeased with the boundary maintenance activity of Mr. Walker. When Mr. Walker presented the superintendent with this rationale for this behavior, Mr. Run insisted that new territories be established. "I agree with you. They're not used to close supervision. But I hope your scores will come down next time" shows the superintendent's desire for a more critical evaluation of the principal's observations.

During the Christmas break and the first two weeks in January, the Union County Teacher's Association realized that new boundaries were about to be drawn regarding supervision. Although the committee formation for developing standards and procedures for the use of PR-80 was established by the central administration in cooperation with the teacher's association, principals were not excluded. This again indicates that, in the final analysis, principals must be recognized by both superiors and subordinates as the systemic linkages and points of tangency between these two groups. It is this inevitable recognition that defines the ultimate power of the role of the principal. He is the last line of administration to carry out the dictates of school policy. Whether he is used in the development of policy or not used, and it is the contention of this report that he should be, the implementation of

school policy, rests in the principal's role. His perception of that policy, and the backing he receives from his superiors in implementing the policy, has a strong bearing on the type of learning that will occur in the school building.

When Mr. Walker tried to establish the new boundaries for observation and evaluation in the January faculty meeting, he met with resistance. Armed with the thrust of the teacher's association's input into the district committee, the faculty pressed for maintenance of the old territories. Mr. Walker took a firm stand on the issue, leaving the broader policy issues to the findings of the committee. The new boundaries for observation had been drawn, and the policy was implemented as the superintendent wished.

For Mr. Run to establish this policy in Mr. Walker's schools, he first had to ensure that the new territories between his role and the principal's were established. Mr. Walker's attempt to maintain the old boundaries in his schools were successful until Mr. Run clearly changed the boundaries between himself and the principal regarding observation and evaluation.

Based on this data and other the other examples that could not be presented in this paper, the following model was developed regarding the implementation of policy within the conversion process of a political subsystem.

The Model

I. Policy decisions and their operationalization will be congruent if the policy can be implemented without a disturbance of physical and co nitive territories of the subsystems.

II. The extent to which policy decisions redefine established territories of subsystems will be the extent to which such policies are misinterpreted, reinterpreted, or frustrated in their implementation.

III. In the implementation of policy decisions, subsystems will first attempt to operationalize the policy without disturbing existing boundaries.

IV. When cognitive or physical space exists that is not legitimately or informally claimed by a subsystem, policy decisions will be interpreted to claim such physical or cognitive space.

V. Policy statements regarding the formulation of substantive goals and objectives will be viewe as nonthreatening to existing cognitive and physical territories by members of the subsystem.

VI. Policy statements regarding the formulation of procedures and devices for achieving goals and evaluating performances will be viewed as threatening to existing cognitive and physical territories by members of the subsystem.

VII. The application of existing policies to ongoing operations will be viewed as reinforcing existing cognitive and physical territories and, therefore, will not be seen as threatening.

VIII. Ad hoc decisions made without future implications will be viewed as nonthreatening to existing cognitive and physical territories by members of the subsystems if accompanied by a power act of influence.

IX. Ad hoc decisions made without future implications will be viewed as threatening to existing cognitive and physical territories if accompanied by a coercive power act.

X. A school principal is the point of tangency and systemic linkage between the central administration and school staff regarding policy implementation.

XI. A school principal is the point of tangency and systemic linkage between the central administration and school staff regarding the implementation of building policy in the school.

XII. Coercive power acts across systemic linkages will be viewed as threatening to existing cognitive and physical territories and result in disagreement.

XIII. Influential power acts across systemic linkages will be viewed as nonthreatening to existing cognitive and physical territories and result in disagreement.

XIV. Third parties, such as parents, superiors, or responsible community members, who form a systemic linkage with members of the conversion process, will be viewed as threatening to existing physical and cognitive territories by members of the subsystem.